



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,403	01/09/2002	Glenn C. Godoy	END920010097US1	9024

7590 10/21/2008
John R. Pivnichny, Ph.D.
IBM Corporation, N50/040-4
1701 North Street
Endicott, NY 13760

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/042,403	Applicant(s) GODOY ET AL.	
	Examiner CAM-LINH NGUYEN	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication filed on 09/11/2008.
2. Applicant's amendments to claims 1 – 19 are acknowledged. Consequently, claims 10 – 19 have been cancelled. Claims 1 – 9 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
5. Claims 1 – 3, 6 - 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iyengar et al (U.S. 6,018,627) in view of Kirit Talatik (U.S. 5,873,094).

♦ As per claim 1,

Iyengar discloses a method of updating business control data comprising:

- "Developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and building said rules into a common database using a common data administration application"

See Fig. 1 and 7, col. 3, lines 64 - 65, col. 4, lines 27 - 33. In particular:

- A "common database" corresponds to the "repository 20" that stored business information or enterprise modeling.
 - "A common data administration application" corresponds to the application that creates the business application such as in Fig. 2 - 9.
 - "Business rules" corresponds to the "business modeling" (col. 8, lines 45 - 49).
Business rules are derived from the legacy item which including pre-existed applications (col. 3, lines 58 - 63). This includes the meaning of "spanning plurality of application". And the repository stores all business rules and relationship between them (col. 4, lines 28 - 33). This data corresponds to the common data between applications.
- "Entering business control data into said common database using said common data administration application" See Fig. 7 - 9, col. 9, lines 23 - 48. "Business control data" corresponds to the "business logic data".
 - "Disseminating to a plurality of applications, respective portions of said business control data according to said business rules" col. 3, lines 1 - 2, col. 12, lines 35 - 51.

Iyengar teaches that the components can be deployed in different environments (col. 11, lines 26 - 29); the deployment process involves verifying that the necessary support software is installed at the right level (col. 12, lines 35 - 36); a wizard can be used to deploy the software (col. 12, lines 44 - 45); and the packaged components are instrumented for the systems and application

Art Unit: 2161

management by appropriate deployment hints and management hints (col. 12, lines 49 – 51).

Clearly, Iyengar implicitly teaches about the instruction of how to deploy an application by using hints, wizard, or software code to verify all information/software is installed at a particular environment. Further, in the event that the “model having a data structure including a dissemination structure, and disseminating the data based on the dissemination structure” is not included in Iyengar, Talatik provides an example.

Talatik teaches an invention that “allow the users to create their own application directly from the business model” (col. 23, lines 42 - 45, Talatik). The model consists of plurality of flags (col. 3, lines 48 – 49) including “an instant propagation type flag indicates how to propagate the change of instant” (col. 4, lines 57 – 58 of Talatik). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Talatik into the invention of Iyengar because both invention were available at the time and the combination would allow the user to have a custom application and also guarantee the integrity of the data when transferring between applications.

♦ As per claim 2,

- “Additional rules different from said business rules ... entering said business control data... database” See col. 27, lines 42 – 46 of Talatik.

♦ As per claims 6 - 7,

"Wherein said business control data is entered into said common database using a common data administration application" See Fig. 2B - 3, col. 7, lines 29 – 43 of Iyengar. "A common data administration application" corresponds to the application window 35.

"Wherein said common data administration application is adapted to receive input from logged on individuals and from an automated feed from a source system" See Fig. 1 of Iyengar. The "legacy integration" corresponds to the source system.

♦ As per claim 3,

- "Plurality of instances" See col. 5, lines 39 – col. 6, lines 2.

♦ As per claims 8 - 9,

"Entering additional rules into said common data administration application" and

"Wherein said business control data is entered into said common database according to said additional rules" See Fig. 4 – 9 of Iyengar.

6. Claims 4 - 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iyengar et al (U.S. 6,018,627) in view of Kirit Talatik (U.S. 5,873,094) further in view of Souder et al (U.S. 5,724,556).

• As per claims 4 - 5,

Iyengar discloses a system for developing business application using the Unified Modeling Language (UML). However, Iyengar/Talantik does not clearly disclose wherein said plurality of instances run on a corresponding plurality of servers located in corresponding geographical locations; wherein said geographical locations are in disparate continents.

Referring to col. 1, lines 21 – 45, Iyengar teaches that each rule or business model can be applied to a particular environment. Iyengar also teaches that the deployment of component over the Internet (col. 11, lines 16 - 46). Clearly, Iyengar implicitly teaches about the uses of plurality

Art Unit: 2161

of servers located in disparate continents by using the Internet. Therefore, when building the business rules, the rules must define the dissemination structure.

On the other hand, Souder et al (U.S. 5,724,556) discloses a distributed system that includes a distributed modeler for defining business models wherein the business model comprising business locations and the business functions that occur at each business location (See col. 11, lines 40 - 60, Souder). Souder discloses in Fig. 23 that each location only contains specified modules. The table in Fig. 23 corresponds to the structure in the instance application. The plurality of instance corresponds to the plurality of location in the table. Each instance can be located in different sites (col. 1, lines 29 -42, Souder).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Souder into the invention of Iyengar/Talatik because the combination would provide more control in accessing data in different nodes or locations (col. 4, lines 13 - 32, Souder).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 09/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

♦Applicant argues that the combined of Iyengar and Talatik does not disclose “disseminating respective portions of business control data to a plurality of applications. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, Iyengar teaches that the components can be deployed in different environments (col. 11, lines 26 – 29); the deployment process involves verifying that the necessary support software is installed at the right level (col. 12, lines 35 – 36); a wizard can be used to deploy the

Art Unit: 2161

software (col. 12, lines 44 – 45); and the packaged components are instrumented for the systems and application management by appropriate deployment hints and management hints (col. 12, lines 49 – 51). Clearly, Iyengar implicitly teaches about the instructions/information of how to deploy an application by using hints, wizard, or software code to verify all information/software is installed at a particular environment. Certain environment has certain components or software.

Second, in the event that the “model having a data structure including a dissemination structure, and disseminating the data based on the dissemination structure” is not included in Iyengar, Talatik provides an example.

Talatik teaches an invention that “allow the users to create their own application directly from the business model” (col. 23, lines 42 - 45, Talatik). The model consists of plurality of flags (col. 3, lines 48 – 49) including “an instant propagation type flag indicates how to propagate the change of instant” (col. 4, lines 57 – 58 of Talatik). The phrase “how to propagate the change of instant” in this case, combined with Iyengar invention, would provide the user with the option of disseminating respective portions of business control (components/software) to a plurality of application as claimed in the claim invention.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAM-LINH NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 4024. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272 - 4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 - 273 - 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*/CamLinh Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2161*